United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/603,675 | 06/25/2003 | Srinivasan Venkatesan | OBC-110.1 | 3783 |
| SCHLAZER, P | 7590 06/05/200° PHILIP | EXAMINER | | |
| Engergy Conve | ersion Devices, Inc. | WEINER, LAURA S | | |
| 2956 Waterview Drive Rochester Hills, MI 48039 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1745 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | • | | 06/05/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| 10/603,675 | VENKATESAN ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Laura S. Weiner | 1745 | |

| Before the Filling of all Appear Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | Laura S. Weiner | 1745 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>24 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: | n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o | Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | e of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejecti | on. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | 06.07(f). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| | nlianae with 27 CER 41 27 must be | filed within two month | no of the date of |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ne appeal. Since |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further contains | onsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | etter form for appeal by materially re | educing or simplifying | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1. | | | (DTO) 00 () |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | | time to filed amondm | ant concelling the |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ winded below or appended. | ill be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <i>1-20</i> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida | lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i | ot be entered s necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa | overcome all rejections under appe | eal and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b | ut does NOT place the application i | in condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | 110 | γ |
| 13. Other: | | Tandi | Ve |
| | | Laura S Weiner Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1745 | |
| | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The addition of "wherein said active composition comprises at least 10 weight percent of said graphite material" raises new issues that would require further consideration and search. Claims 2-7 did not depend from claim 8 from which this limitation has been incorporated. In addition independent claims 9 and claim 15 did not have this dependent claim limitation.